DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 105 944 JC 750 337

AUTHOR	Chambers, M. M.
TITLE	Above High School.
PUB DATE	70
NOTE	66p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Interstate Printers and Publishers, 19-27 North Jackson Street, Danville, Illinois 61832 ($2.50)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC Not Available from EDRS. PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education; College Role; Community Colleges; *Educational Finance; *Educational History; Educational Opportunities; General Education; *Governance; *Junior Colleges; Liberal Arts; Open Enrollment; *Post Secondary Education; Tax Support; Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

This document contains the substance of three lectures delivered at Memphis State University in June 1970. It should be of interest to recent high school graduates, their parents, and other laymen interested in American higher education. The first lecture discusses the history of the community college movement and the changes in popular attitudes toward education. The second lecture proposes methods of creating an academic community on a commuter campus and reviews the historical development of the liberal arts, technical, and adult education functions of the modern community college. The third, lecture discusses the relationship between community colleges and state governments and notes the various methods by which community colleges are governed and financed; the author contends that local tax support is essential. (DC)

ED105944

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ABOVE HIGH SCHOOL

"Let each become all he is capable of being"

by M. M. Chambers
Department of Educational Administration
Illinois State University

Order from
The Interstate Printers & Publishers, Inc.
Danville, Illinois 61832

JC 750 337

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICRO FICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. M. Chambers

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

Copyright © 1970 by
M. M. Chambers

All Rights Reserved

Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 71-138973

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

Let each become all that
he was created capable of being:
expand, if possible, to his full growth;
and show himself at length
in his own shape and stature,
be these what they may.

—Thomas Carlyle

Author's Foreword

The substance of three lectures delivered at Memphis State University, June 23, 24, and 26, 1970, forms this discourse. The focus is on the public two-year community college as broadly conceived in its diverse forms, as a means of making both liberal and occupational education accessible to millions of persons, most of whom would not otherwise obtain any education beyond high school.

National and worldwide well-being will be advanced, not exclusively by rigorously training a small elite corps of scientists and academicians in a few great universities, but also by elevating the level of education among the entire citizenry. For this purpose the "open door" public two-year college is a superb instrument.

It is not proposed that the universities and four-year colleges should abandon their first two years of instruction, or that their freshman and sophomore enrollments should be "frozen" or arbitrarily restricted. Let maximum freedom of choice prevail. This is in harmony with the spirit of an open society; and moreover, it conduces toward the high morale of students and teachers, and the acceptance of individual responsibility which is essential to getting optimum educational results from each dollar invested in the support of higher education.

It is indisputably in the public interest that more and better educational opportunities should continuously be developed for more people. The subtitle of this script, "Let each become all he is capable of being," has been stolen from the seal of

the State University of New York, and is used here with appropriate apology. It expresses the inspiring imperative which is the underlying theme of these lectures.

Competent and faithful help in preparing the draft was given by Joan Marie (Mrs. Peter F.) Schuetz of Illinois State University. For the thoughts embodied, much credit is due to many of my colleagues and advanced graduate students during the decade just past, at the University of Michigan, at Indiana University, and at Illinois State University. The errors and shortcomings are mine.

Above all, I am grateful for the generous hospitality of Memphis State University, whence came the invitation to prepare and deliver the words which here meet the eye.

M. M. Chambers
Visiting Professor of Educational Administration and
Consultant in Higher Education

Normal, Illinois
November 1970

Contents

I. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HIGH SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES 1

From high school to college
Getting people into college
The open door—with updraft
Questions and answers

II. THE CASE FOR THE MODERN COMMUNITY COLLEGE 19

The liberal wing
The technical wing
The adult wing
Questions and answers

III. ADMINISTRATIVE, LEGAL, AND FISCAL ASPECTS OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE TWO-YEAR COMMUNITY COLLEGE 37

Multiple sources of support
Tax support is crucial
The states and the federal government
Questions and answers

BIBLIOGRAPHY 57

INDEX 59

I

The Relationship Between High Schools and Colleges

From the standpoint of the pupil, graduation from high school is a memorable summit. Almost everywhere in the nation it means completion of twelve grades of schooling. Normally occurring at about age eighteen, it may be said to signal the end of adolescence, and the beginning of young adulthood. Recently "young adulthood" has quickly become a much more popular and appropriate term than "late adolescence."

Regardless of the terminology, the young graduate of high school feels himself at the top of a great divide. Behind is his childhood. For a considerable minority as of today, formal education is a thing of the past, at least for the time being. Instead come hopes and visions of work for wages, perhaps early marriage, and the beginning of a new family.

Already a majority, however, have other aspirations and plans. On the nationwide scale, probably 55 to 60 percent of the next few annual crops of high school graduates will go immediately on to some form of education beyond high school, of greater or lesser duration. This may mean anything from eight or more years up the educational ladder to attain a degree of doctor of medicine, to a term of six or eight weeks in a vocational-technical school to master some comparatively simple mechanical skill.

Any formal education or training above the high school has come to be comprehended within the generic term "higher

education." So when we speak of "higher education," or indeed when we speak of "college," we mean not only the traditional four-year liberal arts or professional colleges, but also programs of two years or one year or less than one year as often found in community colleges, junior colleges, technical institutes, vocational schools, or other post-high-school institutions of whatever name or style.

In this concept a "college of cosmetology" offering a six-month course to high school graduates is "higher education" at least for such of its students as have high school diplomas. Many vocational-technical schools admit and instruct high school graduates and non-high school graduates in the same programs. Sometimes their turnover is so rapid that they are hard put to say what percentage of their students are high school graduates and what percentage are not; but the practice is by no means new or shocking. It was common in the early years of the land-grant colleges, many of which have now become large cosmopolitan universities, and some of which are now numbered among the greatest centers of learning in the world.

Let me ask you to accept then, at least for the purposes of these lectures, the idea that when we say "college" for the sake of brevity, we mean the whole length and breadth of formal education beyond the high school, and not exclusively the conventional four-year liberal arts college.

The percentage of an annual crop of high school graduates going immediately on to some further education varies considerably among the fifty states. For several years in California it has been well above eighty per cent, due in part to the early development of two-year community colleges in that state. There are now approximately eighty-five community colleges in California. In virtually all parts of the state there is one such college within commuting-distance from the homes of practically all citizens.

On the other hand, in several states, including some of the

populous and wealthy industrialized states, the percentage does not yet exceed fifty. Many factors contribute to the variation. Without going into that in detail, it is possible to state one universal principle; any county which has no institution of higher education within its boundaries will invariably have a small or modest percentage of its high school graduates going on to education beyond high school. When a new college of almost any type is opened in such a county, provided it is open to residents of the county and has programs attractive to many of them, a large rise in the percentage of college attendance in that county will occur. This has been demonstrated in hundreds of instances.[1]

Let us dwell for a moment longer on the dividing-point between "high school" and "higher education." In the early years of the two-year junior college, it was quite generally thought of as an extension of secondary education. Usually it was based on a public school district already maintaining one or more high schools and elementary schools, and could be regarded as a species of capstone of the elementary and secondary school system of the region.

This thought was strengthened by the fact that European secondary schools of that day had programs of from six to nine years in length, and when the problem of equivalencies had to be solved in individual cases, the general conclusion was that British and Continental secondary schools carried their students up to levels about equivalent to the beginning of the third year in our American four-year colleges. Also, there was only sketchy articulation between American high schools and colleges. There was said to be much boring repetition of what was taught in the last two years of high school and the first two years of college; and many educators in both

[1]There are occasional exceptions. I once encountered a small and highly specialized Roman Catholic college for girls, located in a Kentucky county having few Catholic residents, where no resident of the county was a student in the college.

fields said that the offerings in the first two years of American colleges were actually *secondary education.*

However strong that case may have been from a historical and precise professional standpoint, it is dead today. Two-year college students and teachers do not choose to be in an upward extension of secondary education, but in *higher education.* They do not wish to be the stepchildren of a school district primarily concerned with supporting and operating elementary and high schools. They prefer to be governed by a public corporation which is exclusively a *two-year college district;* and this has increasingly become the case in recent years.

For the moment I overlook the fact that many two-year public institutions are branch campuses of parent universities, with no tax support from the local level. A considerable number of others are "free-standing" *state two-year colleges.* There are also observable tendencies of two kinds pointing in the same direction: (1) in three states once having well-developed networks of locally-based junior colleges, these have been converted to *state junior colleges* in recent years; and (2) in the twenty or more states in which primary local support plus substantial state aid prevails, the state's share of the tax support of the public two-year colleges is increasing. These matters will receive more attention in the third lecture of this series, which deals with financial and legal aspects of the picture.

There is something to be said, too, for the concept of the community college as a thin-sliced segment of education which is unique—not a part of secondary schooling, and not a part of higher education. That idea, however, will not prevail. It is useful to stress the many and important features that are unique to the two-year segment, but it is not necessary to conceive of it as a thin anomalous wedge driven between secondary and higher education. It is a segment of higher

education, and you will be unpopular if you try to call it other than that.

From High School to College

Through most of the nineteenth century it was generally thought that elementary schooling, then spoken of as a "common school" education, was amply sufficient for the vast majority of all Americans. It was not until 1874 that the famous decision of the Michigan supreme court in the *Kalamazoo Case*[2] gave impetus to the development of free public high schools.

Prior to that, such secondary schools as existed were mainly private academies or "prep schools," devoted exclusively to the college preparatory function. The concept of the comprehensive secondary school, offering options among several differentiated programs such as college preparatory, general, commercial, and agricultural or other vocational, was practically unknown. At that stage it was unavoidable that the colleges should dictate the secondary school curriculum.

As the public high schools multiplied and their enrollments mushroomed, it soon became apparent that at least a majority, and in many cases much more than a majority, of their graduates would not continue in formal education; that many of them were not interested in the classical requirements for college admission, and it was thus widely asserted that the curriculum of the secondary school was not designed to fit the needs of a great majority of its pupils.

This was accompanied by bitter exhortations to revolt against the domination of high school curricula by the colleges; and that was a prominent note in the relations between high schools and colleges from the turn of the century to

[2] *Charles E. Stuart* v. *School District No. 1 of the Village of Kalamazoo et al.*, 30 Mich. 69 (July 21, 1874).

World War Two. This was a period of increasing emphasis upon vocational education in high schools. At first some large city school districts established or enlarged specialized technical high schools, some of which acquired great reputations, and some of which flourish to this day; but gradually the idea of the comprehensive high school—with classical languages and woodworking and sheet-metal fabricating and everything between, all offered in appropriate places and on suitable "tracks" in one large school attended by everybody's sons and daughters—won the day.

Hundreds of the smaller rural high schools, with the aid of federal and state subsidies, added programs in vocational agriculture and home economics (later supplemented by distributive education) whose teachers were trained in the land-grant colleges, also with federal subsidies. These efforts accomplished much for agriculture and for the quality of life on the farms, but turned out to be in part a huge example of the futility of much specific and long-range vocational education, when it became apparent in the nineteen-thirties that thenceforth half or more of all rural youth could not be employed on farms, and would make their way to the cities, where they would be totally unprepared with any specific vocational training for the occupations open to them, and tragically unequipped to deal with the conditions of overcrowding and poverty which most of them would meet there.

There were other responses to the rigidity of the older high school curricula. For a time prior to World War Two the flexible and permissive tenor of "progressive education" flourished, but made only limited inroads into secondary school practices. One interpretation of "general education" in secondary schools would focus for most pupils on the problems uppermost in their own minds at their own stages of development. It would identify these problems and bring to bear upon them all that could be drawn from any and all of the relevant school subjects, as well as what could be contributed

by the business and professional leaders of the community. It has never been widely applied, perhaps chiefly because there have never been enough broadly competent teachers available to make it work.

Not entirely unrelated to this was "life adjustment education," apparently involving a theory that since a large majority of high school pupils would never go above the educational level of high school graduation, society's best tactic would be to concentrate on teaching them to conform cheerfully, be resilient and amenable to compromise, and above all to make successful "adjustments" to whatever conditions might threaten them with anxiety.

Probably each of these ideas embodied some merit, if not pushed to extremes; and certainly each of them contained much that is bad, if followed slavishly and without a saving skepticism. One of the net results, among others, of the period in which they flourished was a considerably increased flexibility in high school curricula and in college admission standards. Not for a long time has it been necessary to study four years of classical language in high school in order to be admitted to a liberal arts college, as was generally true at the beginning of this century. There is less of rigid "sequentialism" than ever before, as between high school and college.

This greater freedom of choice has important consequences. First, it means that if each of the rapidly increasing numbers of high school graduates is to find or construct for himself a program beyond high school which he thinks is worth studying and which will be profitable to him and to society, then the diversity of the total offerings available in higher education must undoubtedly become greater than ever before. Second, providing this diversity and at the same time improving the standards of teaching and learning will require relatively larger and better-educated teaching staffs in colleges and in high schools than we have ever been accustomed to. In short, teacher-student ratios will have to be increased,

and the general level of education of teachers will have to go up.

These matters will be discussed again among the financial aspects of the picture in the third lecture of this series; but they cannot be entirely omitted at this point.

One of the commonest remarks heard everywhere today, and rightly, I believe, is "Our young people today are smarter than we were at their age." They know a great deal more about more things, partly because their schools are better, but also in part because they have grown up with some media of communication, such as newspapers and magazines, that are now much more numerous, available, and generally of better quality than in earlier days. Half a century ago television did not exist at all, and radio was only in its infancy. Bad as its programming may have been up to now, television is much better than nothing of the kind at all, which is what we had when my generation was in high school and college and ten years after that.

The various pressures for flexibility and permissiveness in schools went into something of a temporary eclipse with the onset of World War Two, when the whole climate of the time shifted toward rigor. Immediately after the war, the millions of veterans who flooded into the colleges and schools brought with them a distinctly no-nonsense atmosphere. This influence was carried forward into the fifties by the smaller numbers of Korean War veterans; and tremendously intensified, as well as somewhat distorted, by the pressure-cooker concept of science education and technological training that descended on the land in 1957 when the orbiting of Sputnik by the Soviet Union was interpreted as meaning that the other Great Power in today's world had stolen a march on us, and must be taken with utmost seriousness as a rival threatening our scientific and technological pre-eminence.

Now, a dozen years later, and after our own space-science establishment has made the first moon-landing and return to

Earth, there is opportunity for a little less feverish attitude toward science education and a trifle less emphasis on the cult of "scientism" in human affa'rs. As this tension eases, it may be hoped that the view from high school to college will brighten and broaden to envision multiple avenues through which students can pursue their own uppermost interests and curiosities.

Education beyond high school will be less of a regimented treadmill within the bounds of narrowly defined disciplines, much of whose substance is constantly becoming discredited and irrelevant to modern life. It will become more of a free search for truth in the realms of philosophy, the humanities, the arts, and the social sciences. We shall outgrow the situation in which many of our most eminent men of science are "babes in the woods" a century behind their time when they face current issues in economics and political philosophy. The spectacle of the organized medical profession bitterly resisting for a generation and more the inevitable steps of social progress in the field of health care has not been an inspiring one.

Getting People into College

It may not sound well, but it must be said that a good deal of college recruiting of students in the past has been motivated perhaps more by what were deemed to be the interests of the college, than by the best interests of the student.

It is a commonplace that most colleges, on account of the public relations value ascribed to winning athletic teams, compete with each other fiercely to recruit the best high school athletes. It has often been alleged that these individuals are exploited. They are overworked and overstrained physically, and often they get only a sketchy academic education. A few of them may go on to brief but lucrative careers in professional athletics; many of them have careers as high

school and college coaches and teachers; a surprising number of them succumb to heart attacks in middle life.

The foregoing type of recruiting, large as it is, is small in comparison with the vast efforts of almost all colleges to recruit academic winners. In theory the huge amount of testing and guesswork involved in the selection and rejection of applicants for admission to selective colleges is for the purpose of matching the college and student, to the maximum advantage of the latter. In actual practice, the motive has generally turned out to be largely an effort to make the college look good by picking applicants who will be *winners* in college and in life. The admissions officer is a "handicapper" whose function is to pick winners.

Only a moment's thought is necessary to recognize that this practice runs counter to the principle of the greatest good for the greatest number. It results in scholarships and other inducements for a few of the best athletes and a few of the best academic scholars each year. For the great masses of prospective students, some of whom may be only uncertainly motivated or in grave doubt as to whether they can obtain the necessary minimum of financial resources, it does nothing.

This handicapper's technique of determining admissions is most prevalent among the older and more prestigious private universities and colleges. They can advance their own status by picking freshmen who already have the advantages of an affluent family, thorough academic preparation for college, and the cultural development that give them a strong likelihood of maturing to become alumni who are wealthy and well-educated, and who will occupy places of influence in the Establishment of their time and be a credit to *Alma Mater* as well as generous donors to her coffers.

All this makes a bright picture, and there is no necessity of disturbing it. Let the Ivy League and its counterparts proceed on that basis. In our pluralistic system we have room for many types of admissions policies, including the elitist policy,

—particularly because the institutions able to practice it to the hilt on high pecuniary and academic levels are comparatively few in number. The essential point is that this kind of admissions policy ought no longer to dominate the whole field of education beyond high school. For the bulk of the field, the orientation of admissions practices needs to be almost wholly reversed. The responsibility becomes, not entirely to grab the most fortunate before some other college gets them, but largely to carry the banner to the many thousands of others having only average or seemingly modest academic and pecuniary assets, and also to those who are *least advantaged.*

It should not fail to be noticed that almost every private university or college nowadays has, and some of them have long had, a practice of making sure that a small token contingent of the disadvantaged are admitted each year, and provided with sufficient student aids, financial and academic. This makes a small dent in the huge problem of more and better education for the educationally-deprived. The economic condition of the private colleges being what it is, this is about all a private college can be expected to do—to make a small gesture of tokenism, which though not large is better than nothing. The real major work of fashioning opportunity quickly, commensurate with the immediate needs and capabilities of what we may speak of for the moment as the non-college population of college age, falls upon the public institutions—the City University of New York, the state universities and the state colleges in fifty states, and the community-junior colleges in many states.

At this point someone of conservative bent is likely to say "Not everyone should go to college." Someone will want to emphasize that many careers of usefulness and of honor are open without a bachelor's degree; and that boys and girls who at the moment have no keen taste for college should not be dragooned into it. This is all true—of the *conventional four-*

year college. It is not true of *higher education*, including all the types of less lengthy and less pretentious formal education immediately following high school.

In 1947 President Truman's Commission on Higher Education declared, "The time has come to make education through the 14th grade available in the same way that high school is now available." Seventeen years later, in 1964, the eminent Educational Policies Commission, a high-level philanthropically supported body which functioned for a quarter of a century and issued a notable series of reports, advanced the proposition that *every high school graduate should have access to at least two years of education beyond high school, with emphasis on intellectual growth, and tuition-free.*[3]

Under this concept the problem of college admissions becomes not "how to keep them out" but "how to get them in." Foremost among all effective devices for that purpose is the plan of making available some suitable opportunity for education beyond the high school, within commuting-distance of every home, wherever practicable. This is in large part the reason why we now have nearly 800 two-year community colleges, and why during the past two years new institutions of that type have been established and opened to students at the average rate of about fifty per year, or about one per week. The two-year public community college is the exclusive subject of the second and third lectures in this series. Therefore we say little further about it here, other than to make sure it is included in the purview of our remaining comments on the relations between high schools and colleges.

A most excellent feature of the scene that unfolds before us now is that there is and will continue to be wider freedom of choice than ever before. Consider:

(1) The high school graduate in an affluent family, with a

[3]Educational Policies Commission. *Universal Opportunity for Education Beyond the High School*, pp. 6, 27. Washington: 1201 Sixteenth Street, Northwest, 1964. 36 pp.

superior academic record and with social and intellectual maturity beyond his age, with plenty of money and parental encouragement and long-standing ambition to have the benefit of attending a prestigious or superior college, is free to go to an Ivy League school or some other analogous one of his choice, into which he can gain admission.

(2) There will be others, some of less affluence, who will want a particular type of private college, whether for reasons of religious faith, or of family tradition, or of any of a hundred other reasons that seem important. They are free to select such a college, if it will admit them and offer them its facilities at a price which they or their families are able to pay.

(3) Others will want to go straight from high school to the big state university or state college where they can plunge right into the stimulating climate of a large academic community that includes a graduate school, comprehensive library and laboratory facilities, and a cosmopolitan faculty and student body.

(4) Perhaps larger than the foregoing three types combined will be those who lack either the money or the motivation, or both, to pursue formal education further, away from the parental home, unless it becomes locally accessible, and unless they are convinced that means will be found to enable them to undertake it and have a fair chance of succeeding in it.

This last is the special merit of the public community college—to provide appropriate opportunities for many thousands who would not otherwise attend any kind of college at all, or obtain any kind of education beyond high school. This is what is happening and must happen if the inevitable dissemination of higher education is to be achieved with reasonable expedition. It is the application of the inspiring imperative that the entire level of higher education for all must rise together—the assurance that the pyramid can be broadened at the base while the apex is built higher, and that this

wealthiest of all nations is able to do both. In the well-known thought of John W. Gardner, we shall attain equality of opportunity for all, and unprecedented encouragement of excellence, too.

The Open Door—With Updraft

The idea of a public college, tuition-free and open to the sons and daughters of working men and women, is more than a century old. That is the land-grant college idea. Its success has been spectacular. Most of the sixty-eight land-grant colleges have now become comprehensive universities in fact and in name. So great has been their contribution to the building of this nation that their aims and methods are now being transplanted throughout the world.

In their early years these institutions had few worries about the technicalities of admission requirements. The prospective students *selected themselves,* and those able to present themselves and apply were admitted. The idea of an open-door two-year community college in every sizable county or town is hardly more than half as old, but it is already in an impressive place as the cutting edge of the dissemination of education beyond high school for all. It provides the indisputable basis for the laudatory statement of Sir Eric Ashby when he recently said in effect, "Every high school graduate in the United States can get into some college somewhere."

In a good sense those words are true. But they are not yet universally true in the sense that all economic barriers have been conquered. If there is any one theme that should and indeed already does permeate the whole matter of relations between high schools and colleges, it is the theme that we must continue for a long time to work hard to prevent poverty from depriving young men and women of educational opportunity. It is not enough to say that almost every college admits and provides financial aids for a small quota of eco-

nomically deprived students, and that the public community colleges are open to all high school graduates, usually at low fees or no fees.

Nearly all colleges now have an obligation, in addition to their customary communications with high schools related to the attracting of superior athletes and merit scholars, to find and encourage worthy individuals among those who are so low in the economic scale that they see no possibility of education beyond high school. It is now possible for such young persons to be discovered during their high school years or even earlier, and told convincingly that education beyond high school is a probability for them. This is of the letter and spirit of the Higher Education Act of 1965, in its provisions for Educational Opportunity Grants which are in fact federal scholarships for students whose families are unable to contribute more than $600 a year toward their college expenses. In combination with provisions for work-study part-time employment, and other possible student aids, it seems probable that increased funding of this type of national legislation may go a long way toward the surmounting of economic barriers. The prospect is made all the more hopeful by the announcement in March 1970 by the President of the United States of the goal that no one should be deprived of education on account of lack of money, by 1976, the bicentennial year.

This goal necessitates continued revolutionary change in the dealings of colleges with high schools. I do not dwell on the well-known techniques such as advanced placement of superior high school students so they will not have to mark time going through the motions of studying subjects they have already mastered. These are commendable within limits. I do not go into the technicalities of standardized testing of achievement and of aptitudes as predictors of college admissions. It is enough to say that these devices will continue to be used by many colleges and professional schools, and that

no doubt they will be gradually improved for their particular purposes. They will also no doubt continue to be useful for purposes of academic and occupational counseling. What I stress here today is that tests designed for the fair-haired boys and girls of opulent suburban high schools must not be used to exclude wholly from high-grade educational opportunities the boys and girls from backgrounds so deprived economically and culturally as to make the tests very largely inappropriate and irrelevant to them.

I am not alone in that assertion. It is widely recognized and increasingly implemented. A great new era of democracy in educational opportunity is on the march. It will mean much to the nation's economic growth, and to the development of a more humane and more cultivated society in all the states.

Q.

Is it widely understood that "higher education" may include much more than was formerly connoted by the vernacular phrase "going to college," especially when it meant a four-year traditional college of liberal arts?

A.

It is not as widely or thoroughly understood as it needs to be. There is a good deal of unjustified reluctance to accept the idea that short occupational courses for high school graduates are a part of the total program of higher education. It will be difficult to understand some of the most important problems in higher education until the broad concept is comprehended and adopted.

Q.

Were there any secondary schools, other than academic or "prep schools" in the United States prior to 1875?

A.

Yes. A few. In the middle 1850's Pennsylvania established the Pennsylvania Farmers' High School which later became Pennsylvania State University. Analogous events took place at about the same time in Michigan and a few other states. In the Southern states there was a considerable number of military schools of high school level. Also there were some "female seminaries" sometimes known as "finishing schools" whose instruction was generally not above high school, or at most a year or two beyond. In a sense, some of these schools were remote precursors of the two-year community college.

Q.

Does "two years beyond high school, *with emphasis on intellectual growth*" necessarily mean two years of academic liberal arts education?

A.

No, except for those who want it. Technical or occupational courses are not without intellectual substance; and in the best programs of that type there is a certain concurrent infusion of instruction in English, speech, communications, history, civics, sociology, or other subjects of a liberal or general educational character.

II

The Case for the Modern Community College

The modern community college is a public two-year institution serving primarily the people of its own locality. This generally holds true regardless of the details of its financial support and governance, which we shall examine in the third lecture of this series. It may be supported and governed by a local public school district, or it may be based on a local taxing subdivision created for community college purposes only, or it may operate as a local branch campus of a state university, or it may simply be a state-supported two-year college, not based on any taxing district and not under the wing of any other institution.

In any case its clientele is composed wholly or largely of people who live within commuting distance, lodged in their own homes, who do not have to leave home and establish separate maintenance in order to attend the college. The vernacular term is "commuter college," which also applies equally well to some types of four-year colleges and universities located in large cities. In an earlier time these were somewhat derisively called "streetcar colleges." There was, and I suppose continues to be, some prejudice against a commuter college education, based on the thought that the commuting student tends to be on the campus very little except during the hours of his scheduled classes.

Conditions for learning may not be ideal when the student drives into the parking-lot, rushes for the classroom, and as

soon as the class is over, runs for his automobile and drives away as promptly as possible. He does not have the benefit of leisurely hours in the college library, meals with his friends and classmates in the college dining-halls, plenty of time to engage in the various student activities of the campus, and the general civilizing effect of living full-time in the academic community as an independent member of it, enjoying its recreational and social aspects, debating intellectual questions with fellow-students, and consulting freely with professors and counselors.

Granting all this, the first response is that an education in which these good opportunities are missing or infrequent may indeed be much less than ideal, but it is certainly better than no education at all. The cold facts of the matter merely demonstrate another aspect of the diversity of our system. Some students are able to depart from their home and family surroundings, make a clean break with the familiar associations of their childhood and neighborhood, and go to reside amidst the amenities of student clubs and residence houses, with ample time to make suitable use of the vast and varied facilities of a great university or college as a resident student. Not all can do this. So we make the best of it. With the heavy urbanization of our population, it seems certain that half or more of our students in higher education will soon be commuters, if not already. The urban universities and colleges have many thousands of them, and the community colleges, both urban and rural, have many hundreds of thousands more.

The second response is that the community colleges can and will do a great deal to improve the aspects of their operation which may seem less compatible with learning at its best than those of conventional resident campuses. If many students can not spend many hours each day on the campus, certain facilities can be stretched somewhat to fit their necessities and convenience.

A simple example: the college libraries can be better stocked with up-to-date books, periodicals, films, and records, and their services made more accommodating and attractive. If many of the students can not spend long evenings there, but must snatch occasional daytime hours, then the number of seats in the reading-rooms, in proportion to the total enrollment, should be much greater than has been customary in traditional colleges of similar size.

Many commuter colleges have their classrooms and libraries and laboratories filled with young students during the daytime, and equally or largely filled with adults during the late afternoon and evening hours. They seem to have a chance to accomplish maximum "utilization of space" to an extent that would warm the electronic heart of a computer, and greater than traditional colleges have yet been able to hope for.

The presence of a large contingent of part-time students, and the virtual absence of any students who spend whole days on the campus, creates very difficult challenges for the staff charged with the encouragement of student activities and with most of the other student personnel services. Ingenuity is necessary on the part of the student personnel administration. Often, too, during the early years of a newly-established community college this branch of the staff is sadly understaffed and parsimoniously financed.

These difficulties will be overcome. I do not say that the community colleges will or should exactly duplicate the student life of the conventional resident colleges. Some of the organizations which someone has contemptuously but perhaps accurately called "sandbox student governments" can probably very well be dispensed with. If I comprehend the trend of the times in the participation of students in the corporate life of the academic community, it will tend to take the form of joint undertakings led by composite agencies in which students, faculty members, administrators, and, in

some appropriate instances, members of the governing board will be represented, and wherein decisions will be arrived at by consensus among these elements.

Meantime, before giving full attention to the special merits of the community college, let me remark that contemporary critics often point out the foregoing two areas in which they say there is generally large room for improvement: the library service, and the student personnel services.

If we turn now to classroom, laboratory, and shop, and field instruction, and examine questions bearing on what is taught and what should be taught, we shall find ourselves thinking of the "liberal wing," the "technical wing," and the "adult wing." The comprehensive community college serves three broad purposes which are in part distinct from each other, but actually not wholly separate except in pure theory.

The Liberal Wing

The function of the junior college as originally conceived three-quarters of a century ago by William Rainey Harper of the University of Chicago and perhaps some other presidents of private universities was simply that of the first two years of a liberal arts college, the equivalent and parallel of the first two years in a four-year college or liberal university. This would free the university from overcrowding in the freshman and sophomore years. It would enable many students to get their first two years economically and conveniently at or near their homes, and equip the best of them then to go to a university or superior college where they would get their junior and senior years in an atmosphere of much higher quality, with a much better-equipped and more eminent faculty than was likely to be provided at a small and meagerly-supported liberal arts college of that day.

The small and undistinguished four-year colleges were invited to decapitate themselves and become two-year in-

stitutions, to act as screeners and feeders for the liberal universities. This invitation they did not accept kindly. Not only have they generally declined to cut their programs down to two years in length; until relatively recent years they have generally looked askance at the development of *public* junior and community colleges with apprehension and resistance, fearing that their own prospective students would be drawn away. More recently, however, instances can be found in which a private college has actually affirmatively encouraged the establishing of a public community college in its own town or county.

It has become more and more clear that the public two-year college has its main appeal for the large numbers of local young people who would not otherwise get any education beyond high school at all, much less attend a distinguished private college or a large university. The public two-year college, especially during its early years after its establishment, is not going to abduct many of the local high school graduates who are already pointed toward a four-year college or university.

Moreover, a few years after its beginning it will be found that some of the graduates of the two-year college, some of whom as recently as two years ago did not dare to have ambition for any kind of four-year college, will now be very good prospects for admission to the nearest four-year institution at the beginning of the junior year. This tends to enable a small private college to "beef up" its class sizes in its upper division, where classes have often been so small as to make instruction inordinately expensive per unit. Thus the presence of a public two-year college may turn out to be a buttress and a real benefit to a neighboring private college—far from being a deadly rival.

The early dream of the University of Chicago standing as the nucleus of a widespread network of private two-year colleges which would be its feeders did not materialize; and

it was more than half a century later before the essence of it began to take shape in a form quite different from that in which it was originally conceived. Most of the private universities and four-year colleges have survived, and have watched, often with trepidation, a host of public community colleges sprout up among them, only to observe at last that this is a benefit to them rather than a detriment. The reason is not hard to see. The community colleges get many thousands of people started in college careers who would not otherwise have begun in any college. It then follows as the night the day that a substantial fraction of these new people are going to succeed in two years of a college course, gain confidence and gather momentum, and pour into the upper divisions of four-year colleges and universities.

The whole picture translates into a broadening of educational opportunity and an elevation of the general educational level of the whole nation. If perchance you do not believe these developments are desirable—if you think too many people are already getting too much education—then you and I do not speak the same language. We would probably have to sit down and confer earnestly for a long time before reaching some mutual understandings. I am unable to discover any reason at all for not wanting more and better education for more people.

The slogan, "Let each become all he is capable of being," poses a direct challenge which can not be dodged. We must either repudiate it or act in accord with it. We are doing the latter; and the swift development of community colleges is the most effective step of a century.

The largest element in most community colleges is what I have called the "liberal wing." Usually more than half of the students, and occasionally nearly all, prefer the so-called "college parallel" or "transfer" programs of study which will equip them after two years to proceed to a four-year college

or university. They study the arts and sciences which customarily lead to a baccalaureate degree, because they are ambitious for a liberal education as distinguished from a short-term specific job training intended to equip them with an immediately salable skill which will lead quickly to remunerative employment. In our economy of abundance, comparatively few feel a stark and desperate necessity of immediate preparation for wage-earning.

Whether this is good or bad I do not undertake to say at this point, except to remind you that I have declared for the accessibility of "two years beyond high school, *with emphasis on intellectual growth,*" in the words of the 1964 pronouncement of the Educational Policies Commission.

One can note that of those students who enroll in the liberal wing and aim for the two-year community college credential in arts or sciences, half or more currently do not complete the program and receive the credential. Some observers take alarm at this heavy attrition and point to it as evidence that the community college as now operating is in considerable part a wasteful and misdirected enterprise. Not so. Whether these "dropouts" from the liberal wing then go into the technical wing of the same college, or go to some other institution, or go directly into paid employment, no blame necessarily or automatically attaches either to them or to their community college because of their change of direction.

With the uncertainties and stresses that beset early adulthood, especially in the case of persons who have never had a parent or other older relative who studied beyond high school, and whose financial support is meager and precarious, a two-year academic undertaking may often turn out to be a choice which for one reason or another must be suspended or abandoned. If each is to pursue his studies as far as he can go with benefit to himself and to society, there is

no dispensation which says the change-point must always be exactly at high school graduation or precisely two years later. It may and often does come somewhere between.

The rate of attrition among two-year community college students will decrease, as the college programs and staffs improve. There are certain built-in advantages of great importance. One of these is that in the study of the social sciences, especially sociology, political science, and business economics, from the very fact that it is a local institution the community college has at its doors a real-life laboratory in which to carry on inexhaustible data-gathering and presentation of problems and alternative solutions to the people of its own clientele.

This is one of the meanings and one of the answers, I think, to the incessantly repeated student demands for "relevance" in instruction. It is well to understand the ideas of the great social theorists of earlier centuries, but it is also good to find what goes on in the real world of today, just outside the gates of the campus. These activities of students and teachers may occasionally inadvertently disturb the local power structure and put the college temporarily on the defensive, but in the long run it is just this that gives life and verve to otherwise dusty academic pursuits, and makes a college a zesty place and saves it from becoming a pedantic desert.

The community college has its own unique chance to bring liberal education to the people. It has frequently been alleged in the past that this "liberal education" function—or the "college parallel" function—has been generally overstressed and overdeveloped, to the neglect of the technical or occupational function in a great many two-year colleges, particularly those that are branch campuses of parent universities. This may have once been true in some instances, but it is less true today. For example, ten years ago when the university branches in Indiana were in an earlier stage, none

of them had programs of two calendar years (including summers in affiliated hospitals) designed to prepare students for state examinations for the credential of Registered Nurse. Now at least five of them have such programs in successful operation. Similar programs are also flourishing in university branches as well as in locally-based community colleges in many other states. There is no evidence that community colleges will fail to develop technical and occupational instruction whenever a real social need and a solid economic demand appears.

The Technical Wing

A bit of the history of vocational education should be sketched. It has received special encouragement and support in high schools from the federal and state governments since 1914. Early in the century the state of Wisconsin gave it a distinct place in the state school system by authorizing local vocational school districts to be set up as corporations separate from regular public school districts, and to have their own taxing power, construct their own plants, and employ their own staffs, all with the encouragement and supervision of an independent state board now known as the Board of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education.

At first these schools were regarded as on the high school level, and in part as an alternative for high school boys and girls who had no flair for academic subjects and who wanted a chance to learn by working with their hands. Eventually they came, however, to a stage where they had few students of high school age and many high school graduates, as well as many adults. In short, vocational and technical instruction has largely moved up to the level of the two-year college or technical institute. Wisconsin's leading Vocational, Technical, and Adult Schools have been offering for some years certain programs for credit up to two years beyond high school, a

few of which are transferable for credit at the state universities.

Recognizing the increasing need for occupational and vocational training at what is sometimes called the "technician" level, or the "subprofessional" or "semiprofessional" level, the federal government has increasingly subsidized "Area Vocational-Technical Schools" in many states. These schools tend to pass through an evolution similar to that described for the Wisconsin schools of similar type;—they tend to train many high school graduates and adults, with decreasing numbers of students of high school age. The proportions vary considerably from state to state, but the trend is strong and clear for vocational education to move up from the high school and into the first two years beyond.

This does not mean that the comprehensive high school must narrow its scope and become exclusively an academic high school. Most Americans do not derive satisfaction from being untrained or incompetent with their hands. Boys and girls alike, even the most academically-minded, enjoy and benefit from some practical acquaintance with the basic elements of home economics. In central city or in small town, all might gain in understanding of ecology and symbiosis, as well as in mental health, from a practical introduction first hand to some of the elements of agriculture. Almost every boy would gain from his opportunity, in a good high school shop and with a good instructor, to acquire the simple skills with hammer, saw, and power tools.

Both the fine arts and industrial arts have points of contact with manual skills which are indispensable to them. Will we come to a stage where the high schools will provide these "practical education" facilities as options to all students, or at least to all who affirmatively choose them? (Not merely to selected ones who appear to have little interest or capability in academic or literary matters). Doing this, will the high schools let bread-and-butter occupational and vocational

training pass up to the next higher level, where it has already gone to a large extent? I do not answer that question. I only suggest.

It has become clear that the community colleges and the area vocational-technical schools are meeting and must meet on an increasing scale the training needs, in programs of two years or less, for may thousands of middle-level occupations that require more preparation than do skilled-labor jobs, and less than do the professional and managerial occupations.

With a large and continuing shortage of physicians and surgeons, each one can give maximum service only when backed and assisted by various paramedical personnel—registered nurses, dietitians, physical and occupational therapists, laboratory technicians, medical secretaries, and others. Many of these are now getting their training, or basic parts of their training, in community colleges.

The same principle applies in other professions. The engineer needs to be backed by a team of draftsmen, surveyors, time-and-motion-study-men, and junior engineering assistants. In law offices, church offices, and business and industrial offices there is an insatiable demand for secretaries and office workers and administrative assistants trained beyond high school, but in many instances with less than a four-year college education.

In the fields of electronics and mechanical knowledge and skills, consider the present unsatisfactory state of the supply of telephone, radio, and television technicians; of automotive engine, transmission, frame and body mechanics. Consider that the mechanization of agriculture and the upgrading of its managerial component now require that its workers have knowledge and practice in applied science and technology above the high school level.

Changes in the nationwide patterns of employment, and shifts in the distribution of people among occupations, continue to expand the vast new field of middle-level careers

that will absorb major fractions of the work-force, while unskilled jobs almost disappear, semi-skilled jobs decrease, and skilled labor jobs decline as a proportion of the total employment scene.

There are literally hundreds of specialized occupational programs of instruction in the nation's eight hundred community colleges. Of course some of those in greatest demand are replicated in hundreds of colleges, while some of the rarest ones, such as citrus culture, for example, appear in only a few. I do not know of any source of information that brings this whole nationwide picture into clear view. So far as my knowledge goes, neither the U. S. Office of Education, nor the Department of Labor, nor the American Association of Junior Colleges has ever collected or published the necessary data. It seems that solid regular accomplishments, day after day and month after month, are not news. It is only sensational or controversial matters that are newsworthy. If a student throws a pie in the president's face, that is big news. Dozens of agencies have counted and analyzed the numbers of campus protests or disruptions in recent years, but no one has thought it worth while to record and make known the wide spectrum of occupational instruction in the nation's community colleges.[3a]

In that connection it is pleasing to report that Professor G. Lester Anderson of Pennsylvania State University announced in March of this year the beginning of a study of community college programs in *paraprofessional* fields, not including the technological studies. He was quoted as saying a preliminary sampling of 90 community colleges had indicated 28 programs in health and medical services; 13 planned to train educational assistants; 10 functioning in recreation; 6 in gov-

[3a] My point is that this is nowhere done all-inclusively. Some of it appears in publications of the U.S. Labor Department, and of the American Association of Junior Colleges, and in educational journals and the daily press on an occasional and fragmentary basis.

ernment planning and administration; and 26 in community services ranging from law enforcement to social work. He also recognized, but had not undertaken to analyze, the two-year institutions' "great success with two-year occupational programs geared to a scientific or engineering base."[4]

Professor Anderson thinks "the fastest growing labor market in the country today is for paraprofessionals—people trained in the basic skills of human service occupations," at subprofessional and semiprofessional levels, in work related to health, mental health, welfare, public administration, law enforcement, education, communications, and the like. These occupations, together with others based on the technology of the manufacture and distribution of material goods, will be making greater and greater demands for vocational-technical training in the community colleges.

The Adult Wing

The comprehensive community college can not confine itself to eighteen-year-olds and nineteen-year-olds recently out of high school. Ambitious adult workmen want to use it as a ladder to upgrade themselves from skilled laborer to technician. Adult housewives want to use it as a cultural center—a link through which they can maintain connection with the moving world of art and music and the intellectual stirrings in the passing scene. Women whose children are grown want to use it as a bridge to enter or re-enter remunerative employment. Farmers can use it as a center for meetings and discussions of the endless series of new problems of agricultural production and marketing. Merchants and manufacturers can use it as a source of information regarding market potential and labor supply in the locality, present and prospective. The whole adult population can use

[4]Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802. News release, March 19, 1970.

it as a cultural center, as a source of up-to-date information, and as a builder of community morale.

The college exists not exclusively for the "college kids," but to serve the whole community. It can be flexible in scheduling three-day "institutes," two-week "workshops," and all sorts of conferences and occasional meetings of every kind that particular groups within its constituency may need. It can be flexible in scheduling classes and courses for credit, far beyond the formerly rather rigid practices of most four-year colleges. Some adults will want afternoon classes; some will want evening classes. In the actual process of scheduling it may turn out that some classes are made up exclusively of adults, some of young students only, and some of mixed age-groups.

Fortunately most community college teachers soon forget the compulsive attraction of regimenting young students in groups in which all are of the same age and at exactly the same academic level, and the vague and unjustified fear that the presence of one or a few older persons may be embarrassing and distracting to students and teacher. In my own experience in teaching in college and university I have always found that the presence of such persons is really a great asset. I am convinced that such mixing of ages promotes academic achievement, but also that it can do much to bridge the "generation gap" and guard against the "irrelevance" which is persistently and sometimes with good reason charged against a good deal of college instruction today.

If a class of nineteen-year-olds also includes a mature keen-witted housewife, a hard-headed business man, a garbage-collector, and a local labor union leader, it is not going to be easy to run through last year's lecture with no questions or comments from students; and it is not going to be possible to conduct a discussion or colloquium in a social science group without touching any of the great controversial issues of the day.

In short, with the presence of a few adults of differing backgrounds, the class session is more likely to come alive than if nobody above the age of twenty is present. Students who have had fourteen consecutive years in conventional schools sometimes let their minds wander when asked to grapple with big issues of the day. Some may slavishly try to write everything in their notebooks. Others may keep silent for what they deem to be diplomatic reasons; or say nothing except to parrot what may appear to be the views of the instructor. Others may just doze. This frustrating quiescence is almost invariably broken up by one or more students of more mature years and having some experience in the workaday world.

We have now briefly noticed: (1) the liberal wing, (2) the technical wing, and (3) the adult wing. Let us emphasize that these three are not mutually exclusive, with concrete walls between them. They overlap and interpenetrate each other. The "college-parallel" students and faculty members are rescued from the futility of the ivory-tower syndrome by their daily association with practical-minded technicians and adults. None of the technical programs of instruction is wholly devoid of any contribution to the liberal and intellectual education of the students.

Although one function of the community college may be to provide "quickie" technical courses only a few weeks in length, to develop relatively simple skills that are in demand and immediately salable, we no longer use the word "terminal" in describing such courses. Its connotation carries too much of finality. Such is the modern rate of technological change that within ten years today's "quickie" skill may be obsolete; the very job for which it was learned may disappear; and the learner will be back at the community college to master a new skill or to upgrade himself in some other way. It is no longer safe to speak of any course of instruction as "terminal" as far as the working life of an individual is concerned.

This has always been true to a much broader extent than is often recognized. Consider for a moment the old two-year normal schools of the nineteenth century. They were supposed to be two-year terminal schools. They had no connection with the four-year colleges and universities of the time. They were a species of "post-elementary" institution, for the sole purpose of preparing teachers for elementary schools. But instances abound wherein a poor farm or village boy went to a nearby normal school because he could not afford to go to any other school, and became a common school teacher for a few years, after which he went to a four-year institution, and later to a graduate school, eventually earning bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degrees, and upgraded himself to a city school superintendency or a university professorship.

The way upward in this country is not a series of narrow and rigid ladders going up to different heights, with no crossways between them. It more nearly resembles the broad and flexible rope ladder which can be thrown over the side of a ship from stem to stern, and on which lateral as well as vertical progress can be made. This, I am confident, will describe with increasing accuracy the internal relationships among programs of study in the comprehensive community college, and the external relations of community colleges with four-year liberal and professional colleges and universities.

There are questions and issues, and also perceptible trends, regarding the financial support and the legal position of the public two-year college. Reserving them for the third and final lecture in this series, let us sum up at this point: The comprehensive community college in one form or another, located in large and small population centers throughout the nation, will make opportunity accessible to millions of young people and adults who would not otherwise be able to obtain any formal education beyond high school. It offers a base for further advanced liberal or professional education, as well as occupational training for workers at the technician level and

in the growing subprofessions and semiprofessions, and also short-term training for immediately salable skills for those who need and want them. It serves as a cultural center and within reasonable limits as an information and service agency for youth and adults of the whole community within commuting-distance. It is the basic and primary public agency of universal higher education—the frontier educational institution of this century.

Q.

Is it reasonable to suppose that in the next generation almost every boy can have a better job than his father had, and almost every girl can have a better life than her mother ever knew?

A.

Positively yes. Menial manual jobs are disappearing. It is almost impossible to find a "white wing" with broom and pushcart cleaning the streets, or a hod-carrier on a construction job—or even a manual elevator operator. The demand for unskilled workers and farm workers is decreasing. Numbers employed in technical, paraprofessional, and junior managerial occupations are increasing. Pick-and-shovel work, which once employed many thousands of men, has been almost wiped out by earth-moving machinery. The level of the whole scope of the job-world has been elevated and continues to go up. More women are employed in remunerative jobs than ever before, and generally at higher levels.

Q.

Do you agree that there is no reason at all for not wanting more and better education for more people? What guidelines should be added to such a statement?

A.

For one, higher educational opportunities should be widely diversified, offering everything from programs of a few weeks of training in some simple occupational skill to ten-year advanced graduate and professional programs.

Too, there can be more freedom of choice and more flexibility for individual students.

We can afford all this because the Gross National Product will soon be $1,000 billion annually, and three per cent of it would nearly double what we are now spending for annual operating expenses of all higher education.

Q.

In addition to providing sufficient seats in the library reading-rooms to accommodate "peak loads," are there other ways to expand and extend the library services in a "commuter college"?

A.

Many, too numerous to describe in detail here. One is to increase the circulation of books by minimizing the holding of non-circulating volumes on "reserve shelves," and encouraging teachers to allow students to read in many sources on a flexible schedule rather than expect a whole class to read from one or two books at the same time. Also, the "grand central station" type of reading room, filled with huge tables and stiff chairs, can be supplemented by placing many comfortable chairs and low tables among the "open stacks," saving the reader's time by enabling him to work with the books he needs right at his elbow, without the red tape of signing call slips and waiting for delivery.

III

Administrative, Legal, and Fiscal Aspects of Higher Education in the Two-Year Community College

Before going into the details of internal institutional administration, it is preferable to look first at what may be called external administration—the relations of the public community college to the other types of institutions of higher education in the state, and to agencies of the state government.

First, note again that a branch campus of a state university may be named a community college, and in a sense may actually be one. Currently in the state of Kentucky the only public community colleges in the state are fourteen branch compuses of the University of Kentucky.

Second, by contrast, a public two-year college may be a "free-standing" state college, not a branch of any institution, bearing the same legal relation to the state as other state colleges and universities. The state of Georgia has twelve state junior colleges.

Third, a community college may be based primarily on a local taxing district, but receiving some state financial aid, and subject to a greater or lesser degree of state control. A majority of all community colleges in the nation are now in this position. California and Texas and Florida, and New York and Michigan and Mississippi, taken together, have nearly 200 two-year colleges in this status. Illinois and Iowa

and Kansas and Nebraska and Oregon and several other states have many more.

Two trends are visible: (1) a few states in this latter class have recently moved to full state support and increased state control; and (2) where the scheme of shared local and state support and control continues, the state's share in both has tended to increase almost everywhere.

Aside from all the various issues concerning the sources of control and support, one can perhaps say that the fact that in some 800 places in the United States a two-year public college exists and operates, transcends all the associated lesser disputes. The important fact is that the two-year college is there, and accessible to the local people. It may not be all that it should be, but generally it is young, and almost surely it will improve over the years.

However, some of the principal arguments about control are worthy of brief review.

(1) For the university branch campus, it is said that problems of accreditation and transfer of credits are largely avoided, because the local two-year college students are enrolled in the parent university itself, and its credits are generally accepted at full value by other colleges in the state and elsewhere. It is also said that the planting of two-year colonies by the university in suitable locations is a more expeditious way to get a statewide network established than waiting on local initiative in each case, involving the formation of taxing districts, the local voting of bonds and taxes, and all the usual preliminaries. On the other hand, it is often argued that the branch campuses tend to be too tightly under the domination of the instructional departments at the main campus, and that they sometimes use the branch campuses as dumping-grounds for their less competent faculty members. It is also said that the branch campuses are generally preoccupied with "college transfer" instruction, and do not give sufficient attention and effort to the occupational and technical training function of

the two-year college. As the years go by, some of these arguments have less force than formerly.

(2) For the two-year state college that is not a branch of any other institution, the same advantage of getting started without heavy dependence on a local taxing district may be claimed, and the rapid establishment of a dozen such "regional community colleges" in Massachusetts in the nineteen-sixties affords an example. Control of these networks tends to be more and more centralized in the state capital, and removed from the communities in which the colleges are located. The two-year colleges are all governed by a single governing board for all public higher education, as in Georgia; or by a single governing board for several institutions of their type, as in Oklahoma; or they report to a statewide Community College Board which has virtually all the plenary powers of a governing board, as in Massachusetts and Virginia. Usually the colleges have no local boards, or have only local boards with no more than advisory duties. In Virginia all members of the local advisory boards are appointed by the all-powerful State Board of Community Colleges, which is the real governing board for all the two-year colleges.

(3) For the more numerous two-year local public colleges that really fit the name of "community college" because they are based on local taxing districts and have locally-elected boards of trustees, the following arguments are made: the community supports them at least in part by taxing itself, and also has a substantial voice in their policy-making through its own locally-elected representatives. The local district is a corporation which owns the site and plant of the college, or at least holds it as trustee for the state. Thus the college "belongs to the community" in a sense somewhat more realistic and legitimized than would otherwise be the case. It is sometimes said that only under this plan can it fairly be assured that the college will really be responsive to the particular needs of the community, develop its program and character

in close relation to the demands of its own clientele, and have precise aims and efforts somewhat different from those of any other community college.

You recognize the wish for local autonomy in the county or local subdivision; and you are equally aware, I hope, of the great desirability of autonomy in an institution of higher education. These two kinds of autonomy are in large degree compatible and harmonious, and they are both urged as the best of reasons for the type of community college here described.

There are at least several states, however, in which many of the counties and towns do not have the demographic and economic resources which favor establishing a community college; and there are many places where it turns out to be extremely difficult to establish, upon the initiative of local electorates, some other type of taxing district suitable both financially and demographically to be the base of a community college. This is one reason why this type of 2-year college has not yet played a very large part in several important states; and continued trends regarding the increasingly limited financial ability of local districts seem to make it doubtful now that this type will ever become universal.

One can hope that a large degree of community autonomy and of college autonomy can be preserved and strengthened in the face of the tendency for all or most of the financial support to come necessarily from the state and the federal government. I think in higher education we must discard the ancient adage, "He who pays the piper calls the tune," and recognize that in community colleges, and indeed in all colleges and universities, a great deal of the tune-calling is done locally by the institution and its constituency, if the best educational value is to be obtained from each tax dollar invested.

The states, and particularly the federal government, show signs of a wise understanding that not every dollar going for higher education should go for tightly categorized purposes,

followed by elaborate auditing for tight compliance. This kind of financial support can and should be supplemented by annual grants to all reputable institutions, expendable at their own discretion for their own general purposes, and "without strings." This kind of support would allow the institution to continue its integrity and autonomy at least in some degree, and save it from becoming no more than a branch office of a federal or state bureaucracy. This integrity is what a lively institution of higher education thrives upon, and fosters pride and morale among students, teachers, and local citizens. Without these, Homer Babbidge of the University of Connecticut has wisely declared, "a public college loses control of its own destiny, and is no more entitled to be called an institution than is a local postoffice."[5]

The spirit of the place is far more important than any particular structure for the governance and support of community colleges in any state. Looking at the nationwide picture and considering the nationwide future, it is better to abstain from doctrinaire contention for any rigid type of structure, and concentrate on the *substance* of what makes a community college good—to see to it that it does well what a community college is supposed to do, fitted to the local circumstances. This will not produce a statewide network of colleges that are all alike, and all equally mediocre. It will not cause them all to report the same unit cost per student per year; but will allow reasonable latitude for variations, for local exercise of inventiveness and initiative, and for progress adjusted to changing conditions. Keep your community college system flexible. Perhaps let two or three different types flourish in the same state, as is now the case in Wisconsin, Indiana, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.

[5]Homer D. Babbidge, Jr. "Design and Change in American Higher Education," pp. 1-6 in *Long Range Planning in Higher Education,* edited by Owen A. Knorr. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1965. 128 pp.

Multiple Sources of Support

Of the operating income of the public community colleges, what proportions come from the federal government, the state, and the local taxing district? How much can come from private gifts, and how much, if any, can and should come from student fees?

A nationwide survey of this matter as it stood in the academic year 1967-68 was made by the Institute of Higher Education at the University of Florida.[6] In that year forty-two states had one or more community colleges. In fifteen of these states, the community colleges got no financial support for operating expenses from any local taxing district. But in California, with more than eighty community colleges, sixty per cent of annual operating income came from local districts. The median figure among these 42 states was 21 per cent from local sources.

As to support for operating expenses from state funds, commonly called "state aid," in 21 of the states (half of the 42) the percentage was 50 or more; and in seven states it was 75 or more.

The federal contribution to operating income was small, ranging from zero reported by three states up to 24 per cent reported by one state; and generally less than ten per cent. Here is the largest likelihood of improvement eventually, if and when the federal government gets into a position to give priority to domestic concerns.

Having hastily considered tax support from local, state, and federal sources, one can next look at student fees as a source of operating income for the community college. The University of Florida survey indicated that in only one state—California—are the community colleges entirely free of student

[6]Lawrence Hinkle Arney, *State Patterns of Financial Support for Community Colleges*. Gainesville, Fla.: University of Florida, Institute of Higher Education, February 1970. 48 pp. litho.

fees. It is quite well known, however, that there are no charges for regular full-time students in the seven community colleges that belong to the City University of New York; and other scattered community colleges in several other states are free to students who reside in their local districts.

The survey showed that in a few other states, including Delaware and Kentucky, there was no operating income from student fees, but explained that in these states student fees are charged and applied to debt service on new academic buildings. It appeared that three states—California, Missouri, and Nevada—had state statutory provisions prohibiting tuition charges. In Missouri and Nevada, however, it was reported that respectively 17 per cent and 34 per cent of their operating income came from student fees. This was accomplished by avoiding the name of "tuition fees" and calling the charges "registration fees" or some other innocuous name—a custom that is common among four-year state colleges and universities in some states.

There were also ten states whose statutes *required* student fees; but the figures showed no important difference, as far as the fee contribution to operating income was concerned, between these ten states and the others whose laws merely permitted student fees, or even two of the three that forbade them. It appears that up to the present the charging of student fees has been determined much more largely by custom among institutions than by law.

With regard to student fees, there are some practices that seem very hard to defend. In at least two states—Massachusetts and Connecticut—student fees equal to 20 per cent and 25 per cent of annual operating expenses are charged, but are not applied to operating expenses at all. Instead, they go directly into the General Fund of the state. Thus they appear to be treated simply as taxes levied on students for the upkeep of all activities of the state government. A "user fee" is being charged for one public service, and then commingled with

the other general revenues of the state instead of being allocated to the service for which it was paid. In a sense, community colleges become just another source of revenue for the state.

Another practice almost equally hard to defend is that of pledging all student fees for the amortization of bonds issued to finance the construction of academic buildings, as is done in Kentucky and Delaware, for example. This deprives the institutions of the added resources and the flexibility which come from being able to apply student fees to annual operating expenses; and to a considerable extent it amounts to compelling the present generation of college students to pay for facilities that will be used by generations of students yet unborn. Underlying it seems to be some sort of theory that students should be forced to pay for the physical expansion of the institution they attend.

In 1969 the legislatures of Ohio and Iowa authorized their state universities to pledge student fees to finance academic buildings, *with the understanding that the legislature will appropriate sums sufficient to restore the fees so pledged to the operating income of the institutions.* The Ohio legislature actually appropriated $20 million for that purpose in 1969; and in 1970 the Iowa legislature in a special session appropriated a much smaller sum.

Even if the successive legislatures actually adhere strictly to their part of the "understanding," this roundabout way of financing academic buildings would not seem to commend itself. As yet no buildings have been financed in that manner in Iowa, pending a state supreme court decision as to whether the plan is lawful in all respects.

It would seem much better to finance academic buildings by (1) direct appropriation, "pay-as-you-go"; or (2) general obligation bonds of the state; or, if neither of these is possible, (3) creation of a "state building authority" with borrowing power—a unique type of public corporation—as has been done

in New York, Georgia, Illinois, and a few other states. It should not be necessary to entangle student fees with the financing of academic buildings.

In fact, the soundest view of the whole matter is that, for community colleges at least, there should be no student fees at all. As we move toward serving larger and larger numbers of people who are financially handicapped, and many of whom do not appear to be above average academic aptitude for that very reason, why maintain fees which will have to be remitted or refunded or otherwise used for student aids? The only apparent justification is the outmoded device of charging those who can pay and giving free service to those who can not pay. The most equitable solution of that problem is to charge user fees to no one, and provide the financing from taxation which reaches the whole public, just as the benefits of the community college reach the whole public.

If we combine the charging of fees with the granting of student aids, every college student aids officer becomes a bureaucratic mogul before whom increasing numbers of students must appear as petitioners, laying bare their private financial affairs and pleading for assistance, at the feet of the all-powerful one who decides who gets what and how much. The process becomes almost indistinguishable from a Depression bread-line. Naturally there are many spirited young people and many families who will have none of it.

If student fees are abolished, in most instances a majority of community college students will be able to attend without financial help; but there will continue to be need for a modest-sized student aids enterprise to help some students with maintenance expenses and instructional materials. Student aid will continue to be necessary and useful, but not the tail that wags the college dog. The college will not become a large-scale dispenser of handouts to some while collecting cash fees from others,"robbing Peter to pay Paul."

The idea of charging the well-to-do and treating the poor

without charge is a relic of a time when society was little organized, and a college or hospital or a library was a rare small oasis, necessarily operating on a restrictive basis and serving only clients whom it chose, and on its own terms.

A *public* college or university is a *public* facility from which the whole public derives important benefits, regardless of sex or age, and regardless of whether a given individual or his children ever attend as students. The presence and operation of the college brings more employment, improved business and industry, and better health conditions. It seems quite archaic to think such an enterprise should extract "user fees" from any of those who sacrifice their time and earning-power to join it as students and add their energy and ability to its progress.

That thought could be tolerable if the age-old "economy of scarcity" persisted—the condition in which there are continual shortages of all kinds of material goods and services; money and credit are hard to come by; production and distribution of goods can not supply the needs of the people. That condition has disappeared in our corner of the world. We are flooded with goods and services beyond the wildest dreams of any previous generation; we have surpluses of food and fiber; most of us overeat; cash is plentiful and everyone is urged to accept more credit than he needs; yesterday's luxuries have become today's necessities; the "working class" has become the "middle class" and gained possession of the luxuries of yesterday. All this is good. It is our transition into an "economy of abundance" contrasted with yesterday's "economy of scarcity."

In the midst of this rising standard of living, let us not forget that higher education had much to do with the increased productivity per man-hour in agriculture and industry that made the abundance possible; and much to do with the improved medical services that lengthened the normal span of life expectation and elevated the standards of sanitation

and public health. How can we take these gains for granted, and think of keeping education on a "user-fee" basis, as it was in the eighteenth century? Education is primarily an indispensable benefit to the whole society; and in our economy of abundance the states and the nation are abundantly able to support it largely by taxation.

Tax Support Is Crucial

If student fees eventually disappear from the scene, there will continue to be at least four major sources of operating income for community colleges: (1) private gifts, (2) a local taxing district, (3) the state, and (4) the federal government.

In most instances private gifts may not be a large factor, but they are in the reckoning. Remember that some years ago Charles Stewart Mott, wealthy philanthropist of Flint, Michigan, not only gave the Flint Junior College a splendid site and physical plant, but also $6 million in endowment funds, the income of which could be used for operating expenses.

As community colleges grow older and have larger numbers of alumni, and develop closer acquaintanceships among the owners and managers of local businesses and industries, and with the leaders of local labor, professional, and commercial organizations, their likelihood of receiving a growing stream of gifts and bequests from alumni and other friends will increase. Here one must add that attractiveness to private donors is likely to be brightened by emphasis on the local character of the college and upon its work with the people of its own community; and may be reduced if not destroyed by an image in which the community college is regarded as only a branch office of a statewide chain controlled by "absentee landlords" in the statehouse bureaucracy. Scarcely any private donor wants to make a gift or bequest to a statewide conglomeration of colleges.

Probably one legal step is desirable in view of the danger just described. Unless the community college is based on a local taxing district which is unmistakably a public corporation, with a local governing board legally capable of receiving charitable gifts (and even also perhaps if it has that status) it may prove advantageous to the college to procure the incorporation of a private nonprofit corporation to be known by some such name as the Community College Foundation, and having among its charter purposes the power to receive and be legal custodian of gifts on behalf of the college, and power to do other things designed to promote the welfare of the college, such as to acquire and manage property, and to pay over to the college annually or oftener all the net proceeds of these activities, and not otherwise.

Such a Foundation should have a small board of directors or trustees on which the president of the college, the chief business officer, the dean of academic affairs, and other representatives of the faculty and student body should sit *ex officio*, with approximately an equal number of seats filled by leading local citizens, including philanthropists and others. Such a board, in the absence of a local governing board for the community college, can perform the functions of receiving gifts and being custodian of nontax income for the college, of looking to its community relations, acting as a bridge between the college and the general public, and conducting private fund-raising.

But private donors will usually be a source of only relatively small portions of the institution's income. Most of it will come from appropriated tax funds. In many states the part played by the local taxing district is now important, and will continue so. In *all states* having community colleges of any type, the role of state legislative appropriations is now large and is increasing rapidly. In *all states*, the contributions of the federal government, not yet comparatively

very large, may be expected to grow enormously within the next ten years, though they may not expand during the next two years of a conservative national administration.

The States and the Federal Government

As is the case with all public higher education, the legal responsibility for support of the community college rests chiefly with the state legislatures. A recent Governor of North Carolina, Terry Sanford, who was known nationally as an "education governor," summed up in these words:

"In at least one activity, it is undisputed over the years that the money from the states has achieved excellence. That is public higher education. The nation has become strong through the support the states have given public higher education... Much of our preeminence as a social and governmental system has come from our unrivaled state-based university and college system... The university capacity of America couldn't have been put together in a crash program. It has grown over many years by state nurture."[7]

The word "education" does not appear anywhere in the United States Constitution or in any of its Amendments; but as all are aware, there has been a national concern with the support of education since the drafting of the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, which was two years before the Constitution was adopted by the states. This early forerunner of national policy provided for grants of land from the federal government to the states of the Northwest Territory for the support of education, and contained the famous mandate, "schools and the means of education shall be forever encouraged."

Three quarters of a century later came the Morrill Act

[7] Terry Sanford, *Storm over the States*, pp. 63-64. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967. 218 pp.

which encouraged the establishing of sixty-nine land-grant colleges (at least one in every state), and the long train of supplemental supplementary acts of Congress running down to the present. Then came, between 1930 and 1940, the Depression agencies, including the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration, the latter with its resident training programs and its student-work program which helped students continue in some 1,500 colleges or more, plus many high school students above sixteen years of age.

During World War II the various armed services used many of the colleges as training sites for thousands of their men in uniform, and compensated the colleges appropriately, thus saving them from financial hardship which would have been severe if all their physically able male students had been taken away. At the close of the war came the "G. I. Bills" of 1944, under which millions of men and women demobilized from the armed services were enabled to be students in colleges and high schools and to participate in "on-the-job training" in factories and on farms for the next few years.

A new G. I. Bill was enacted to cover veterans of the Korean war; and eventually we had the Permanent G. I. Bill of 1966, which provides educational benefits for all who are veterans of a substantial period of service in the armed forces, either in wartime or in peacetime. Also during the period since World War II there has been developed the very large program of federal grants and contracts for research projects executed by investigators in universities and colleges.

The foregoing long history shows that the federal government has always contributed to the financial support of higher education, and in the long run on a greatly increased scale. It is now more appropriate than ever that the federal contribution should grow, absolutely and relatively, because the federal government is now collecting more than two-

thirds of all tax money collected by all levels of government in this country.

This has come about because of economic and social changes that are irreversible. Only a government unit as large as the national government itself is now able to levy and collect efficiently the forms of taxation that are now the heaviest producers of revenue; chiefly personal and corporation income taxes, both at high rates and with the individual tax steeply graduated. This situation compels a choice: Either most of our public services, including education, must be financed and administered from the national capital (which no one wants), or the national government must provide regular grants-in-aid to states and institutions.

There is not complete agreement as to whether, in the case of higher education, the grants should go to the state governments and be allocated by them, or whether they should go directly to the institutions on some simple formula basis, thus strengthening the ability of the universities and colleges to manage autonomously their own academic and financial affairs. There is a considerable consensus among presidents that the grants should go directly to the universities and colleges, to cover a fraction of their regular annual operating expenses, and to be disbursed at their own discretion without outside interference.[8] This would simplify the relations between the institutions and the state, and preserve for the colleges at least a modest sphere of internal self-management and institutional integrity, which seems to be presently impaired by pressures from Washington through categorical aids and pressures from the state capitals for statewide centralization and uniformity.

It is now time to summarize the five principal sources of operating income for the community college:

[8]Lanier Cox and Lester E. Harrell, *The Impact of Federal Programs on State Planning and Coordination of Higher Education*, p. 146. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1969. 238 pp. Litho.

(1) If we mean what we say about an open-door college, accessible to all without regard to economic status, then *tuition fees* must eventually disappear. There will be no more problem of student aids to pay tuition fees, but there will be some student aids for the expenses of personal maintenance for students from families of low income. There will be the G. I. Bill and the student-work or "work-study" opportunities and the Educational Opportunity Grants under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and we may hope for some extensions and refinements of all these.

(2) Income from private gifts and bequests can be cultivated by every college, and at least with some modest success if the college avoids being forced into the mold of uniformity and being given the image of a mere 'branch office' of the state government. This means retaining and developing its distinctive character as a community institution of which its constituency can be proud and toward which individuals and families develop a real affection. This means high morale among students and faculty, and the most and the best education for each dollar invested, whether it be a gift dollar or a tax dollar.

(3) The biggest current source of income is state legislative appropriations. This will continue to be a major source. In the ten years from 1960 to 1970 state aid for operating expenses of local public junior colleges alone, in twenty-nine states, grew from $50 million to approximately $500 million a year. The states are improving their revenue systems, and there is room for more improvement without hardship. The states are not "up against a ceiling."

(4) It is not the states, but the cities and other local subdivisions that are in a revenue crisis and find it often impossible to support their own essential public services unaided. For this reason, local tax support of community colleges, though it will be with us for a long time, probably can

not be expected to grow as rapidly as state and federal support.

(5) Federal funds for community colleges do not yet constitute a relatively large source of operating income, but this is the place where in the long run the largest increases will occur. To be sure, at this moment there is a slowdown; but greatly increased federal support of all education beyond high school within the next ten years is inevitable. Community colleges will participate in this, partly through acts of Congress already enacted, and probably in a larger part through statutes not yet enacted, but already introduced in preliminary form.

The community college in its various forms will be a very large factor in raising the national level of education and improving the quality of life for many millions of Americans. The resulting benefits will spread to each and every citizen, regardless of age or sex or race or economic condition. Tax support of the community college, and of higher education in general, will be a superbly productive investment of public funds.

Q.

Is it fair to say "we move toward serving larger and larger numbers of people who are financially handicapped, and many of whom do not appear to be above average academic aptitude for that very reason"?

A.

Yes. It is now universally recognized that persons who have been economically deprived since birth, and have not had the advantage of educated parents, good books in the home, and good schools, generally can not "appear to be above average academic aptitude" simply because of those

deprivations. This is not to say wealth and intelligence always go together, or that poverty and stupidity are always linked; we know this is not true. Part of the difficulty is in our narrow and inadequate ways of testing academic aptitude, which may be improved.

Q.

Is it true that "the benefits of the community college reach the whole public," and is it therefore sound to say the college should be supported mainly by tax money?

A.

Many reasons document this:

(1) The college is "open door," to all persons, young or old, who can benefit from it.

(2) The local economic advantages (more people, more "velocity of trade," an upgraded middle-level work-force for local industries, a gradually heightened cultural level for the whole community) accrue in some measure to every citizen.

(3) The state and national economic growth and general well-being are based on upgraded education of the entire citizenry. A college is a buttress to the state and the nation; not a private club for the exclusive benefit of a privileged few who pay dues.

Q.

Why must the federal government collect more than two-thirds of all taxes collected by all levels of government?

A.

Because in the modern economy *income* is a much better

measure of ability to pay taxes than is *ownership of property;* and so much of the total income-producing enterprise is in the hands of large corporations and wealthy individuals whose businesses are nationwide and often international, that only the largest unit of government can tax them equitably and efficiently. (Forty states have state income taxes, generally at comparatively low rates. These are the second largest producer of revenue for the states, but the total collections are quite small compared with those of the federal income taxes.)

Q.

Should the present complex system of federal categorical grants-in-aid for higher education be supplemented by direct grants to each reputable institution to cover a fraction of its regular annual operating expenses; such grants to be allocated on some simple formula basis, such as number of degrees conferred annually at different levels?

A.

Several of the great national associations of universities and colleges have declared in favor of this idea. It is probably the best available way of accomplishing the necessary large increases in federal support of higher education without infringing further upon the integrity and autonomy of the institutions.

Bibliography

American Association of Junior Colleges. *A Guide to Health Technology Program Planning.* Washington: The Association, 1967. 52 pp.

———. *An Introduction to American Junior Colleges.* 1967. 50 pp.

———. *Preparing Two-Year College Teachers for the '70's.* 1969. 24 pp.

American College Testing Program. *The Two-Year College and Its Students.* Iowa City, Iowa: 1969. 157 pp.

Blocker, Clyde E. *The Two-Year College.* Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965. 298 pp.

Burnett, Collins W. *The Community Junior College: An Annotated Bibliography.* Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, College of Education, 1968. 122 pp.

Cohen, Arthur M. *Dateline '79: Heretical Concepts for the Community College.* Los Angeles: Glencoe Press, 1969. 256 pp.

Collins, Charles C. *Junior College Student Personnel Programs.* Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967. 46 pp.

Cross, K. Patricia. *The Junior College Student: A Research Description.* Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1968. 56 pp.

Educational Policies Commission. *Universal Opportunity for Education Beyond the High School.* Washington: National Education Association, 1964. 36 pp.

Garrison, Roger H. *Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems.* Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967. 90 pp.

Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. *This Is the Community College.* Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1968. 151 pp.

Harlacher, Ervin L. *The Community Dimension of the Community College.* Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969. 140 pp.

Harper, William A. *1969 Junior College Directory.* Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969. 109 pp.

Johnson, B. Lamar. *Islands of Innovation Expanding: Changes in the*

Community College. Los Angeles: Glencoe Press, 1969. 368 pp.
Kelly, Win, and Leslie Wilbur. *Teaching in the Community-Junior College*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970. 295 pp.
Pirie, James W. *Books for Junior College Libraries*. Chicago: American Library Association, 1969. 452 pp.
Wattenberger, James L. *Junior College Local and State Relations*. Gainesville, Fla.: University of Florida Institute of Higher Education, 1968. 66 pp.
Wiegman, Robert R. *General Education in Occupational Education Programs Offered by Junior Colleges*. Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969. 26 pp.
Yarrington, Roger. *Junior Colleges: 50 States—50 Years*. Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969. 297 pp.

Index

Academies, private, 5
Admissions officers as "handicappers," 9, 10
Adults, programs for, 31-33
Advanced placement, 15
Agriculture, 6, 29, 46
Anderson, G. Lester, 30, 31
Arney, Lawrence Hinkle, 42
Articulation between high schools and colleges, 3
Ashby, Sir Eric, 14
Athletics, 9
Attrition, 25, 26
Automotive technology, 29
Autonomy for institutions of higher education, 40, 41, 51, 63

Babbidge, Homer D., Jr., 41
Branch campuses of universities, 4, 19, 26, 27, 37-38
Buildings, financing of, 44, 45

California, 2, 37, 42, 43
Chicago, University of, 22, 23
Cities absorbing rural youth, 6
Cities have revenue crisis, 52
See also Urbanization
Civilian Conservation Corps, 50
"College parallel programs," 24, 25
College preparatory function, the, 5, 38
"Common school" education, 5
Communications technicians, 31
Community services, 31
Commuter college, the, 19-21
Comprehensive high school, the, 5, 6
Conferences, institutes, and workshops, 32
Connecticut, 43
Cosmetology, 2
Cox, Lanier, 51

Delaware, 43, 44
Districts, community college, 19, 37, 38
Diversity of offerings, 7, 36
"Dropouts" in the community college, 25, 26

Economic barriers, 14, 15
"Economy of scarcity" is of the past, 46
Educational assistants, 30
Educational Opportunity Grants, 15,52
See also Scholarships
Educational Policies Commission, the, 12, 25
Electronics technicians, 29
Employment, changing patterns of, 29, 30, 31
Engineering draftsmen, 29
Equivalencies between European and U.S. credits, 3
European secondary schools, 3

Federal financial support of higher education, 41, 42, 49, 53, 54, 55
"Female seminaries," 17
Financial support, multiple sources of, 42-47
"Finishing schools," 17
Flexibility in high school curricula and college admissions, 6, 7
Flexibility in scheduling college classes, 32
Florida, 37
Florida, University of, 42
Freedom of choice, 12, 36
Fund-raising from private sources, 47, 48, 52

Gardner, John W., 14
"General education," 6
"Generation gap," the, 32
Georgia, 37, 39
"G. I. Bills," 50
Government planning and administration services, 30-31
Gross National Product, the, 36

Harper, William Rainey, 22
Harrell, Lester E., 51
Health and medical services, 30, 46, 47
Higher Education Act of 1965, 15, 52
Higher education defined, 1, 2, 16

Illinois, 37
Indiana, 26, 27, 41
Iowa, 37, 44
"Ivory-tower syndrome," the, 33
"Ivy League," the, 10, 13

Jobs for women, 35
Jobs, upgrading of, by technological change, 35

Kalamazoo Case, the, 5
Kansas, 38
Kentucky, 3, 37, 43, 44
Kentucky, University of, 37, 43

Land-grant colleges, 2, 49, 50
Law enforcement education, 31
Liberal wing, the, 22-27
Libraries, 21, 36
"Life-adjustment education," 7

Massachusetts, 39, 43
Medical profession, the, 9, 29
Michigan, 5, 17, 37, 47
Military schools, 17
Mississippi, 37
Missouri, 43
Modern media of communication, 8
Mott, Charles Stewart, 47

National Youth Administration, 50
Nebraska, 38
Nevada, 43
New York, 37
New York, City University of, 11, 43
Normal schools, 34
North Carolina, 49
Nurses, Registered, 26-29

Occupations, technical-level, subprofessional, and semiprofessional, 27-31, 34, 35
Ohio, 41, 44
Oklahoma, 39
"Open door college," 14, 52
Oregon, 38

Paramedical personnel, 29
Pennsylvania, 17
Pennsylvania State University, 31, 41
"Prep schools," 5, 17
President Truman's Commission on Higher Education, 12
"Progressive education," 6

Radio, 8
Recreation services, 30
Recruiting, college, 9-10, 11-12, 15-16
"Relevance" in instruction and research, 26
Rigor after Sputnik, 8

"Sandbox student governments," 21
Sanford, Terry, 49
Scholarships, 10, 15
See also Educational Opportunity Grants
"Scientism," 9
Secretaries and office workers, 29
"Sequentialism," 7
Social work education, 31
Soviet Union, the, 8
Space utilization, 21
Sputnik, 8
State aid to local community colleges, 37, 38, 39, 42, 52
State Junior colleges, 4
"Streetcar" colleges, 19
Student activities and personnel services, 21
Students, part-time, 21
Students, recruiting the least advantaged, 11, 15

Tax support is crucial, 47-49, 54, 55
Teacher-student ratios, 7
Technical and occupational programs, 16, 27-31, 33
Telephone technicians, 29
Television, 8, 29
Testing, 10, 15, 16, 54
Texas, 37
"Tokenism" in recruiting the disadvantaged, 11
Tuition should be free, 12, 44-46, 52
Two-year college districts, 4, 39, 40

Unique character of the two-year college, 4
University branch campuses, 4, 19, 26, 27, 37, 38
Urbanization, 20
See also Cities
Utilization of space, 21

Veterans, influx of, 8, 50
Virginia, 39
Vocational education in high schools, 6, 27-29
Vocational education moves up to the community college, 27-29, 31
Vocational-technical schools, 2, 28, 29

Wisconsin, 27, 28, 41
Women as students and in employment, 31, 35
Work-study part-time employment, 15, 52
World War Two, 6, 8, 50

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUN 27 1975

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION